REMARKS

In the latest Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4-9, 21, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bresson et al. (US 5,352,507) in view of Linska (newly cited; US 4,766,811). Applicants initially wish to point out that while the Examiner included claim 1 in the list of pending and rejected claims, claim 1 was previously cancelled in the amendment filed on April 4, 2005. Accordingly, applicants will address the rejection with regard to claims 2, 4-9, 21 and 22.

Linska teaches the use of a double-side coated adhesive foil (2) which is applied to a cover plate on a printing cylinder to prevent corrosion of the cylinder surface. The Examiner has taken the position that it would have been obvious to replace Bresson's adhesive layer 3 with the adhesive-coated foil of Linska. However, as applicants have previously pointed out to the Examiner, Bresson does not teach or suggest a desire for reducing corrosion and abrasion of a printing cylinder; accordingly, there is no motivation to make the proposed substitution. Further, Linska does not teach or suggest use of his corrosion-inhibiting foil as a protective layer in a printing blanket construction as claimed, but rather teaches a separate tape which is adhered to a cover plate. Linksa teaches the application of a separate foil to a cylinder, not a unitary printing blanket having a protective polymer film or sheet adhered to a base ply thereof. The Examiner has failed to carry his evidentiary burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness.

Even if one were to make the proposed substitution, the claimed blanket configuration would not result as Bresson does not teach a printable surface layer **on the first surface** of a **metal base ply**, and a **polymer** which is adhered to the **second surface** of the base ply with an adhesive as recited in previously amended claim 22. Rather, Bresson teaches a printable surface layer over an elastomer layer 5 or 7. The printable surface layer 6 of Bresson is clearly not on the first surface of the metal carrier layer 10, but rather is separated from the carrier 10 by a number of other layers. Claim 22, and claims 2 and 4-9 which depend therefrom, are clearly patentable over the combined teachings of Bresson et al. and Linska.

With regard to claim 21, the Examiner has taken the position that the two adhesive layers of Linska "are understood to read on the '2 or more polymer layers' and the foil is understood to read on the 'corrosion inhibiting film layer therebetween.'" With this amendment, applicants have amended claim 21 to clarify that the corrosion inhibiting film layer is a polymeric film containing corrosion inhibiting adhesives therein. See the specification at page 6, lines 9-12. Linska does not teach or suggest a polymeric film containing corrosion inhibiting additives as claimed. Rather, Linska's corrosion-resistant foil is comprised of stainless steel (see col. 2, lines 42-45).

For all of the above reasons, applicants submit that claims 2, 4-9, and 21-22, as amended, are patentable over the cited references. Early notification of allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

DINSMORE & SHOHL LLP

By Susan M. Luna
Susan M. Luna
Registration No. 38,769

One Dayton Centre
One South Main Street, Suite 1300
Dayton, Ohio 45402-2023
Telephone: (937) 449-6429
Facsimile: (937) 449-6405

SML/

C:\NrPortbl\DAYTON\SLUNA\33799_1.DOC